

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 are cancelled. New claims 22-26 are added. Thus, claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-26 are present for examination.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karam (U.S. Patent Number 6,804,351) in view of Bingley (U.S. Patent Number 4,631,470).

Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karam in view of Bingley and further in view of the applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter AAPA).

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karam in view of Bingley and further in view of Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,973,942) (hereinafter Nelson).

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 are cancelled. With respect to claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-21, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an internet protocol (IP) telephone, comprising:

“an input connector for receiving from a network a signal containing a digital component and a current component;

a separator for separating said current component from said digital component;

telephone circuitry for providing audio input and output;

a central processing unit (CPU) for controlling operations of said telephone circuitry to cause said telephone circuitry to provide said audio input and output; and

a power source circuit for receiving said current component from said separator, said power source circuit comprising:

an input current limiting resistor for limiting said current component;

a direct-current to direct-current (DC/DC) converter that is connected to said input current limiting resistor;

an input capacitor that is charged by said current component;
and

limit removing means for removing the limitation imposed by said input current limiting resistor when said limit removing means is turned on;

wherein said CPU is configured to determine an amount of power being consumed by said CPU; and

wherein said CPU is configured to turn said limit removing means on or off based on the determined amount of power being consumed by the CPU." (Emphasis Added).

An IP telephone including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that: (i) telephone circuitry provides audio input and output; (ii) a CPU controls operations of the telephone circuitry to cause the telephone circuitry to provide the audio input and output; (iii) an input current limiting resistor limits a current component and is connected to a DC/DC converter; (iv) limit removing means removes the limitation imposed by the input current limiting resistor when the limit removing means is turned on; (v) the CPU is configured to determine an amount of power being consumed by the CPU; and (vi) the CPU is configured to turn the limit removing means on or off based on the determined amount of power being consumed by the CPU. (Specification; page 4, lines 5-8; page 5, line 10; page 6, line 27 to page 7, line 2; page 8, lines 10-16).

Such an IP telephone has a CPU that controls operations of telephone circuitry to cause the telephone circuitry to provide audio input and output. Thus, the CPU may, for example, be able to easily recognize power being presently consumed by the IP telephone . As a consequence, the CPU may, for example, turn a limit removing means on or off based on a current power consumption of the CPU to thereby more precisely control an operation of

a power source circuit that includes the limit removing means. (Specification; page 8, lines 10-16).

Neither Karam nor Bingley, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an IP telephone including the above-quoted features with a CPU that controls operations of telephone circuitry to cause the telephone circuitry to provide audio input and output, where the CPU is configured to determine an amount of power being consumed by the CPU, and where the CPU is configured to turn a limit removing means on or off based on the determined amount of power being consumed by the CPU.

The Examiner recognizes that Karam does not disclose an input current limiting resistor for limiting a current component, and that Karam does not disclose a CPU for controlling an IP telephone. The Examiner then points to Bingley as teaching inserting an input current limiting resistor 18 in series with regulating power supply circuitry 22 and the value of the resistor 18 being varied in accordance with the output of a CPU 42. (Emphasis Added).

However, applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite the limitation of, “a central processing unit (CPU) for controlling operations of said telephone circuitry to cause said telephone circuitry to provide said audio input and output”. (Emphasis Added). The incremental control voltage generator 42 of the system of Bingley is not a CPU as recited in amended claim 1, because the incremental control voltage generator 42 of the system of Bingley does not control operations of telephone circuitry to cause the telephone circuitry to provide audio input and output. (Bingley; FIG. 1; FIG. 2a, reference 42; column 5, lines 19-34; column 6, lines 30-49). Instead, the incremental control voltage generator 42 of the system of Bingley simply rectifies an alternating voltage at node 242 to generate an incremental direct voltage across capacitor 228 that is then summed with the voltage at terminal 20 to be applied by way of conductor 40 to the gate of FET 230. (Bingley; FIG. 2a; column 6, lines 30-49).

Moreover, the incremental control voltage generator 42 of the system of Bingley does not even determine an amount of power being consumed by the incremental control voltage

generator 42. Instead, as stated above, the incremental control voltage generator 42 of the system of Bingley simply rectifies an alternating voltage at node 242 to generate an incremental direct voltage across capacitor 228, which is not determining an amount of power being consumed by the incremental control voltage generator 42. (Bingley; FIG. 2a; column 6, lines 30-49).

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Karam and Bingley references and, hence, is believed to be allowable. The Patent Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Because they depend from independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-4, 9-12, and 17-21 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable. With respect to claims 3, 11, and 19, AAPA does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Karam and Bingley noted above with regard to independent claim 1. With respect to claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 18, and 20, Nelson does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Karam and Bingley noted above with regard to independent claim 1.

New claims 22-26 recite features that are not found in Karam, Bingley, AAPA, or Nelson.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 14, 2005

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252